

~~Administrative - Internal Use Only~~

9 March 1976

STATINTL MEMO FOR: Mr. [REDACTED]
Mr. McMahon

SUBJECT : Responses to Coordination of DD/S&T
RD&E Program (DD/A 76-0823, attached)

The following is a summary of the DD/A responses to Sayre Stevens' memo of 20 February. The memoranda are attached.

STATINTL Office of Logistics - S&T memo coincides with OL study to determine where we stand with regard to the state of the art in [REDACTED]. OL suggests that this be considered as a possibility for discussion with Stevens.

Office of Medical Services - ORD has received OMS' formal requirements and has coordinated and incorporated them into their program.

Office of Joint Computer Support - Most of the procedures described in Stevens' memo have been in effect for the past two years and have contributed to improved RD&E coordination. At the working level, ORD and OJCS have effective coordination on RD&E projects related to ADP and computer activities.

Office of Security - No suggestions concerning DD/S&T RD&E coordination process. Working level exchanges and Working Group meetings provide OS and ORD with an effective communications mechanism. Security has not enjoyed the same degree of exchange with OTS which has proposed that they become the single conduit through which OS would send its RD&E requirements to DD/S&T. Given past problems OS has experienced, they suggest that Mr. McMahon explore the focal point issue with the A-DD/S&T to determine if this is the most efficient way of communicating requirements or whether a more formal conduit such as the Chief, R&D Staff/DDS&T, would be preferable.

Office of Communications - Commo acknowledges that their response may be defensive and "nitpicking" in nature, but feels that there is a basis for such feelings. They hope for

~~Administrative - Internal Use Only~~

Administrative - Internal Use Only

- 2 -

a clarification of procedures leading to better products, and will do everything they can to maintain good relationships. They call for each Directorate to perform its responsibilities without usurping those belonging to the others. They call for formal paperwork summarizing the results of informal meetings, clarification of the impact of OC comments and suggestions on adjustments to be made to programs and advice by S&T on any reprogramming which affects any DD/A program. OC is rewriting a memo of agreement between OC and OD&E to reflect an organizational transfer of responsibility for Covert Communications RD&E to OTS.

ISAS - The review milestones associated with the modified budget cycle are an addition to review procedures developed earlier in the 70's. Two items that ISAS feels are worthwhile RD&E efforts are: a computerized system of file records control, and Computer Input Microfilm (CIM - as opposed to the already developed Computer Output Microfilm - COM). A study should be undertaken to examine carefully the potential of the technology against broad Agency requirements and to consider the cost of adapting state-of-the-art equipment to service these needs.


STATINTL

Attachments (8)

Administrative - Internal Use Only

3 March 1976

*Re-written
Save for JAB notes*

STATINTL

MEMO FOR: Mr. [REDACTED]
Mr. McMahon

SUBJECT : Responses to Coordination of DD/S&T
RD&E Program (DD/A 76-0823, attached)

The following is a summary of the DD/A responses to Sayre Stevens' memo of 20 February. The memoranda are *attached*.
~~available if you would like to review them.~~

STATINTL

Office of Logistics - S&T memo coincides with OL study to determine where we stand with regard to the state of the art in [REDACTED]. OL suggests that this be considered as a possibility for discussion with Stevens.

Office of Medical Services - ORD has received OMS' formal requirements and has coordinated and incorporated them into their program.

Office of Joint Computer Support - Most of the procedures described in Stevens' memo have been in effect for the past two years and have contributed to improved RD&E coordination. At the working level, ORD and OJCS have effective coordination on RD&E projects related to ADP and computer activities.

Office of Security - No suggestions concerning DD/S&T RD&E coordination process. Working level exchanges and Working Group meetings provide OS and ORD with an effective communications mechanism. Security has not enjoyed the same degree of exchange with OTS which has proposed that they become the single conduit through which OS would send its RD&E requirements to DD/S&T. Given past problems OS has experienced, they suggest that Mr. McMahon explore the focal point issue with the A-DD/S&T to determine if this is the most efficient way of communicating requirements or whether a more formal conduit such as the Chief, R&D Staff/DDS&T, would be preferable.

Office of Communications - Commo acknowledges that their response may be defensive and "nitpicking" in nature, but feels that there is a basis for such feelings. They hope for a clarification of procedures leading to better products, and

- 2 -


will do everything they can to maintain good relationships. They call for each Directorate to perform its responsibilities without usurping those belonging to the others. They call for formal paperwork summarizing the results of informal meetings, clarification of the impact of OC comments and suggestions on adjustments to be made to programs and advice by S&T on any reprogramming which affects any DD/A program. OC is rewriting a memo of agreement between OC and OD&E to reflect an organizational transfer of responsibility for Covert Communications RD&E to OTS.


 STATINTL

Att: DD/A 76-0823

STATINTL

John:

①  says it will probably be April before Sayre convenes the meeting of ADD's...

② It does seem to make sense that I be the coordinator to interface with  particularly on reprogramming. We will need an internal DDA procedure on R&D interface with SAT - not certainly to get in the way of day to day DDA - SAT traffic re what SAT is doing for us - but for reprogramming. (over)

STATINTL

SPEED LETTER	REPLY REQUESTED		DATE 25 February 1976	
	YES	NO	LETTER NO.	
TO : JAS ATTN:		FROM: HAV		
<p>Jim -</p> <p>Re Program Review: It appears we will get the proposal for DDA blessing in April. <u>I think we will want to have in hand a statement from our offices on each of the items as the basis for concurrence with the proposal and for prioritization.</u> We certainly would want to know, for example, the impact on DDA resources of follow-on action. Will it require more or fewer people? Will it require more funds or will a savings result? Thus it appears we should set up a complementary procedure for "coordination of RD&E Program" within DDA.</p> <p>Reprogramming: Throughout the sections on Program Review and Budget Review he refers states "We will apprise you . . . any other pertinent reprogramming actions" or words to this effect. It is not until he discusses the current year (para c.) that he alludes to "consultation" with respect to reprogramming. I believe OC's gripe, and justly so, is that reprogramming action is being taken without consultation of the interested people. I suggest that the proposed procedure be revised to recognize the need for consultation at all stages of reprogramming.</p>				
REPLY		SIGNATURE		
<p>I'm not sure just how the first few sections of para 2.a. relate with para. 3. There seems to be a disconnect here.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">?</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Lau</i> Helen</p>				
RETURN TO ORIGINATOR		SIGNATURE		